

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of February 25, 2003, the Examiner objected to the use of the term "feedback" in the description of the circuits in the specification, rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as indefinite, and rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by Shin 5,874,844.

In the present amendment, a new specification has been presented that eliminates the word feedback from the description of the circuits, and the claims have been amended to avoid the indefiniteness rejection and further define over Shin.

Shin is described in the applicant's response of December 31, 2002. Briefly, Shin uses a single circuit connected between a reference node and a first node in a trigger inversion output portion 30 and another single circuit connected between a power supply node VDD and a second node in the trigger inversion output portion 30.

In contrast to Shin, applicant's circuit uses multiple circuits connected between a first node and a power supply node and/or multiple circuits connected between a second node and a reference node.

Applicants' circuit further includes transistors and control circuitry for selection of one of the multiple circuits in each set of multiple circuits for use at any one time.

Since Shin does not disclose the use of such multiple circuits and the selection thereof, independent claims 1, 10 and 15 and dependent claims 2-9, 11-14, and 16-19 are not anticipated by Shin.


Independent claims 20 and 24 likewise are not anticipated by Shin because they recite circuits having a plurality of independent source follower circuits that, when selected, provide different effects on one of the upper or lower trip point levels of a Schmitt trigger circuit. Shin does not disclose such selection of one circuit from a plurality of independent circuits. Claims 21-23 are patentable for the same reason claim 20 is patentable.

Method claim 25 recites the selection of one of a plurality of independent parallel source follower circuits and is patentable over Shin for the same reason claim 20 is patentable. Dependent claims 26-28 are patentable for the same reason claim 25 is patentable.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at 650-849-7777, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Date: December 24, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael Lyons 37,386  
(Reg. No.)

for

Francis E. Morris - Reg. No. 24,615

**PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP**

3300 Hillview Avenue

Palo Alto, California 94304

(650) 493-4935